

Confessiones (hrsg. von M. FIEDROWICZ), Trier 2004, 83-103. – I. SCIUTO, Interiorità e male nel *De civitate Dei*: Interiorità e intenzionalità nel «*De civitate Dei*» di Sant'Agostino, Roma 1991, 87-115. – A. SOLIGNAC, Les excès de l'«intellectus fidei» dans la doctrine d'Augustin sur la grâce: NRTh 110 (1988) 825-849. – H.J. STIPP, Übel II. Biblisch-theologisch: LThK³ 10 (2001) 330-332. – P. THELAKAT, Augustine on Evil: LivWo 92 (1986) 355-361. – J. TRELENBERG, *Augustins Schrift De ordine. Einführung, Kommentar, Ergebnisse*, Tübingen 2009. – F. VAN FLETEREN, Prolegomena zu einer Psychologie und Metaphysik des Bösen: *Die Confessiones des Augustinus von Hippo. Einführung und Interpretationen zu den dreizehn Büchern* (hrsg. von N. FISCHER/C. MAYER), Freiburg/Basel/Wien 1998, 107-131. – T.J. WEISSENBERG, *Die Friedenslehre des Augustinus. Theologische Grundlagen und ethische Entfaltung*, Stuttgart 2005. – R. WILLIAMS, *Insubstantial Evil: Augustine and his critics. Essays in honour of G. Bonner*, London/New York 2000, 105-123. – D. WYRWA, Augustin und Luther über das Böse: Philotheos 3 (2003) 154-175.

HERMANN HÄRING

Mani(chaeus)

1. M. in A.'s works – 2. Other sources – 3. The historical M. – 4. Elements of M.'s doctrinal system – 5. M.'s canon and church organization – 6. Ethics and cult in M.'s church – 7. Final remarks

1. *M. in A.'s works.* – As regards the historical person of M., A.'s knowledge was limited. In *haer.* 46, A. refers to M. as «a certain Persian» [1]. The same limited knowledge as regards M. holds true for Manichaean contemporaries (Manichaei) such as Faustus, Felix, Fortunatus, and Secundinus. Their knowledge of M.'s origins (if they disclose any) appears to be limited and vague [2]. An exception is found in *c. Faust.* 28,4: A. speaks accurately of «nescio quis ex transverso de Perside», who came two hundred or more years after the Gospel writer Matthew and who tried to persuade people to believe him instead of Mt about what Christ said and did [3]. A.'s emphatic reference to M. as «a certain Persian» witnesses a double depreciation. First, the Persians were the archenemies of the Romans; thus, by insistently labelling M. here and elsewhere [4] as «a Persian», he is depicted as dangerous [5]. Secondly, the word «quidam» seems to be deliberately used here in a negative way [6]. Yet *haer.* 46, the fullest passage in which A. speaks of M., his doctrines, his church, and its ethics and cult, discloses more, and even quite unique, information. Apart from the fact that according to A. the «certain Persian» is called «Manis» [7], he adds (ib. 46,1) that his disciples preferred to call him «Manichaeus» to avoid the word for «madness» [8]. «unde quidam eorum quasi doctiores et eo ipso mendaciores, geminata N littera, Mannicheum uocant, quasi manna fundentem» (ib.). Indeed, apart from occasional references to «Manis» or «Manes», A. mostly refers to M. as «Manichaeus» [9]. The etymological reason he adduces for the variant

«Mannichaeus» he also mentions in *c. Faust.* 19,22. In this case he provides reference to a personal communication made to him by one of M.'s followers (but without the detail that Manichaeans themselves doubled the letter «n»). There is much polemic to be found in both references. The fact that M. was considered to be «the one who pours out manna» is now confirmed by the minute papyrus *Codex Manichaicus Coloniensis* (CMC) [10]. From this new primary source, the first preliminary edition of which appeared in 1970, we learn that M. saw himself, like Jesus Christ (cf. *Io* 6,31-58), as the one who scatters manna [11].

Notes. – [1] E.g. ib. 46,1: «Manichaei a quodam Persa exstiterunt qui uocabatur Manis»; *De Haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum*, Haeresis, haeretici. – [2] E.g. *Secundin. epist.* p. 896,7sq.: «Persa, quem incusasti, non aderit» (cf. A. *Contra Secundinum Manicheum* 25). Elsewhere M. is simply spoken of as «Manichaeus» (*Secundin. epist.* p. 894,9) or «idem» (ib. p. 899,22); as «beatus pater noster Manichaeus» (*Faust. A. Contra Faustum Manicheum* 1,2; cf. ib. 19,5: «Manichaei ueneranda fides») or «theologus noster» (ib. 20,3); as «Manichaeus» (e.g. *Fel. A. Contra Felicem Manicheum* 1,2.6.8; 2,2). – [3] *C. Faust.* 28,4; cf. ib. 13,4; 28,2. – [4] E.g. *c. Faust.* 13,2; 28,2; cf. also *Secundin. A. c. Sec.* 25. – [5] In his designation, A. is in line with previous and contemporaneous Christian and non-Christian writers in the West. Diocletianus' rescript (now usually dated to 302) to the proconsul of Africa proconsularis already styled M.'s followers as Persians and stressed their Persian danger. Time and again, this charge was repeated in the official documents. Cf. e.g. *Eus. h. e.* 7,31 and among A.'s Latin predecessors e.g. Ambrosiast. in *2 Tim.* 3,6. – [6] In A., «quidam» often has a negative connotation, expressing both disregard and (feigned) ignorance. For «quidam» used with regard to Manichaeans, cf. e.g. *conf.* 5,3; *c. Faust.* 1,1; *ciu.* 1,20; 11,22; *retr.* 1,16,1. – [7] The best mss. of *haer.* clearly read «Manis», like *c. Faust.* 19,22. Elsewhere, however, the best mss. of A.'s works read «Manes». On the problem, its background, and likely solution, cf. VAN OORT, Mani (2000) 455-457. With reference to the just mentioned texts (*haer.* 46,2; *c. Faust.* 19,22), FELDMANN 119 n. 1 erroneously states that – apart from «Manichaeus» – A. also speaks of «Mani». However, this is only the case in some passages from Julian of Eclanum found in A.'s works (cf. *c. Iul. imp.* 3,160.172.187); cf. VAN OORT, Mani (2000) 456sq. n. 26. – [8] «Manis» or «Manes» was considered to be derived from «Maneis» (μανεῖς), the Greek form of the name which in turn was held to be derived from the aorist participle passive of μαίνομαι. This interpretation is recorded by Titus of Bostra and Epiphanius; cf. VAN OORT, Mani (2000) 459. – One of the most famous disciples of M. was Adimantus. – [9] E.g. *conf.* 5,6.8.12; *c. Adim.* 12; *c. adu. leg.* 2,41sq.; *Contra epistulam Manichaei quam uocant fundamenti* 5,6. – [10] Ib. 107,1-6.18sq. (KOENEN/RÖMER 76). Sometimes the Coptic *Homilies* have the variant «Mannichaios» as well; cf. e.g. ib. 28,6.9; 31,3; 56,9; 86,1 POLOTSKY. – [11] Cf. further VAN OORT, Mani (2000) 460sq.

2. *Other sources.* – For centuries, A. was a major (though polemic) source of information on M. Similar but minor sources [12] were provided by Catholic Christians such as Pseudo-Athanasius, Epiphanius, Hegemonius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ephraem the Syrian, Serapion of Thmuis, Didymus the Blind, Titus of Bostra, Theodore bar Kōnī, and Severus of Antioch; by pagans such as

